



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/520,306	03/07/2000	Michael A. Kepler	1631077-0025	9605

7590

08/13/2002

Alex L Yip  
Kaye Scholer LLP  
425 Park Avenue  
New York, NY 10022

EXAMINER

AGDEPPA, HECTOR A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2642

16

DATE MAILED: 08/13/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/520,306

Applicant(s)

KEPLER ET AL.

Examiner

Hector A. Agdeppa

Art Unit

2642

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 June 2002 and 02 July 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 39-86 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 39-86 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 15.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

1. Claims 39 – 86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeLorme et al.

As to claims 39 – 56, DeLorme et al. teach a system and method wherein a user, an agent, a concierge, or some type of third-party provider can access the system of DeLorme et al. to schedule, preview, and/or plan trips and events and receive/offer map information, reservation/confirmation tickets for events, air travel, restaurants, goods or most any other type of service. The above information is presented to a user or

Art Unit: 2642

customer of the agent/concierge via Internet, facsimile, paper hardcopy, mobile phone, wireline phone, or most any other electronic means, whether portable (pager/PDA, etc.) or not. Email is not specifically mentioned in DeLorme et al., but in view of the use of the Internet and the system's contemplation of various electronic media, the use of email would be obvious if not inherent. Furthermore, DeLorme et al. teach a directory database for available products, sources, and/or services which may be offered. Also, the system of DeLorme et al. contemplates use for those traveling for example and therefore, it is seen throughout the description that all goods and services are particular to the region where the user will be staying or traveling to or requires information on, etc. The invention of DeLorme et al. also provides as many available services and goods to a user or customer by providing suggestions or recommendations. Lastly, the invention of DeLorme et al. teach the use of electronic tickets for the aforementioned goods and services such as restaurant or airline reservations, event tickets, etc. that may be sent to or printed out by a user or customer.

What DeLorme et al. do not specifically teach is time limits, updating status of fulfillment requests, and scheduling attempts to provide a user or customer with requested information.

However, inasmuch as the invention of DeLorme et al. contemplates event ticketing and airline reservations, etc. it is inherent that time limits are involved. Furthermore, the invention of DeLorme et al. contemplates further that reservation requests have to be sent to and from third-party providers and that offers may be made and rejected, counteroffers made, etc. If an agent is using the invention of DeLorme et

Art Unit: 2642

al. to serve a customer, it is inherent that the agent would have to send/receive communications to and from the customer, thereby invoking time limits as to events or airline reservations for example wherein the agent must act or serve the customer within those time limits. Also, a user or customer or agent can use the invention of DeLorme et al. to preview events or services or goods before committing to them and so therefore, again, an agent would have to supply a customer with status updates, at least that the service or goods were reserved or bought, etc. Even if it could be argued that DeLorme et al. did not read upon the claimed invention as just described, the claimed invention operates just as a standard call center with agents would operate. The agents in a call center receive calls and usually those calls are placed in a queue and prioritized according to various parameters or preferences, timing issues, etc. This queue is analogous to the last action/next action operation of an agent processing requested concierge-like tasks. Many times, a customer is disconnected or cannot hold until a requested or appropriate agent is available and so callbacks must be scheduled between an agent and customer and many times, announcements are played to callers as to wait time, time until completion, etc. Inasmuch as DeLorme et al. teach the possibility of using his invention in a call center/agent-operated environment, it would have been obvious to operate the call center in such a manner as call center is a first aspect of the invention and the actual reservation/scheduling/planning, etc. is simply a second aspect of the invention. Col. 13, line 30 – Col. 16, line 31, Col. 17, line 1 – Col. 22, line 37, Col. 29, lines 45 – 67, Col. 31, line 15 – Col. 32, line 26, Col. 33, line 53 –

Art Unit: 2642

Col. 34, line 56, Col. 50, lines 27 – 67, Col. 51, line 1 – Col. 53, line 5, Col. 54, lines 21 – 67, Col. 64, lines 1 – 10.

As to claims 57 – 62, DeLorme et al. has been discussed above. Further taught by DeLorme et al. is using a user or customer's preferences to select or provide goods or services as seen in Col. 19, lines 32 – 67. The TRIPS etickets, maps, electronic media can be likened to a second record including at least information concerning a location of the provider, for example, information regarding a certain restaurant that a traveler would come across. The invention of DeLorme et al. in giving a user or customer the opportunity to make a restaurant reservation, inherently means that an agent, whether local to that area or an actual agent of the restaurant would have to fulfill the reservation request. Furthermore, DeLorme et al. contemplate use of their invention by hotel chains, state tourism bureaus, etc. and as discussed above, a user may modify or reschedule his/her itinerary as so desired. Inherently this means that a user would plan his/her trip and preview or select certain services or goods that might be used or purchased and once the user is in the appropriate locale, using the invention of DeLorme et al. again to alter modify or confirm certain services or goods. Therefore it is obvious if not inherent that an "appropriately located" agent would serve that customer's needs.

Also, including various information on an eticket or "second record" is old and well known. For example, on an airline ticket, contact information must be provided and so inasmuch as the invention of DeLorme et al. teach the ability to provide airline tickets, including a telephone number would be obvious if not inherent. Furthermore,

Art Unit: 2642

since the invention of DeLorme et al. functions via wireline/less phones, PDA devices, laptops, electronic media, identifying a user is necessary and as is again, so very well known in the arts, such information can be gleaned from caller ID, ANI information, IP address, device ID, etc.

As to claims 63 – 89, DeLorme et al. has been discussed above. Since the invention of DeLorme et al. may be used via wireline/less phone, Internet, mobile service provider, etc. it is inherent that a switching unit would be used and information about a customer taken from the request-originating device and associated with a user or customer. How else is the invention supposed to operate without some form of switching unit when using a phone for example? Examiner is not aware of any communications technology that exists and operates without the use of a switch or gateway or some type of software providing switching capabilities.

As discussed above, it is obvious if not inherent that a user or customer would use the invention of DeLorme et al. via some agent in a call center. Voice servers, interactive voice response (IVRs) features are almost standard in any call center. Furthermore, most automated services employ the use of some type of voice server acting as an operator. One need only pick up a standard telephone with voice mail service to experience this feature and so even if it can be argued that such is not contemplated by the invention of DeLorme et al., it would certainly be obvious for one skilled in the art to include such a feature therein. Also, DeLorme et al. in Col 14, lines 48 – 52 teach that his invention may be implemented as an automated agent or in Col. 14, line 66 – 13, as a kiosk or any number of automated embodiments. Furthermore,

Art Unit: 2642

"connecting the communication call to the information assistance service after the request is fulfilled" is simply returning a caller to a main menu for example and is again obvious if not inherent in the invention of DeLorme et al. as already discussed.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments filed 6/3/02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Examiner's response to applicant's arguments are incorporated above in the rejections.

### ***Conclusion***

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. US Pat 6,134,530 (Bunting et al.)

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hector A. Agdeppa whose telephone number is 703-305-1844. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon thru Fri 9:30am - 6:00pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad F. Matar can be reached on 703-305-4731. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.



Art Unit: 2642

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4700.

H.A.A.  
July 31, 2002

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ahmad F. Matar". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Ahmad" being more prominent than the last name "Matar".

AHMAD F. MATAR  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2700